

Appln. No. 10/612,423

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1736

III. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

By this paper, Applicant is amending claims 7 and 15. After entering this amendment, claims 1-17 remain pending.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because in paragraph [0017] the reference number 86 was used to designate both a *boss* and *threaded boss*. Paragraph [0017] has been amended refer to number 86 as the *boss* only. Accordingly, it is believed that this objection has been corrected.

The drawings were also objected to for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because they did not include the reference number 94 mentioned in paragraph 0018. Paragraph 0018 has been amended to change the reference from 94 to 92. Accordingly, it is believe that this objection has been corrected

Objections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 15 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the limitation "said open end" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from Claim 14, thus establishing sufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, it is believed that this objection has been corrected and the claim is in proper form for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/612,423

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1736

Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,573,326 ("Iijima"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As noted by the examiner, Iijima discloses an adjusting device of a vehicle lamp. See Iijima (Title). It consists primarily of a housing 11, and a reflector 14 that is tilted by operating an adjusting mechanism 15. *Id.* at col. 3, lines 45-47. The adjusting mechanism 15 is made primarily of a joint member 16, a screw nut 17 and an aiming screw 18. *Id.* at col. 3, line 67 and col. 4, lines 1-7. The screw nut 17 is rotatably mounted in a holding tube 14b that is molded into the reflector 14. See *id.* and Fig. 1. The aiming screw 18 is inserted through a supporting portion 11d of the housing 11 and is threaded into the screw nut 17. *Id.* at col. 4, lines 6-12 and Fig. 1. The aiming screw 18 is held in place and unable to move axially, relative to the housing 11, by a push nut 25 and gears 20 and 21. See *id.* at col. 4, lines 12-16, 30 and Fig. 3(A). From this, it is submitted that Iijima fails to disclose an adjustment member coupled to the housing and movable between advanced and retracted positions *relative to the housing*. Since Iijima discloses an aiming screw 18 that remains fixed relative to the housing 11, the rejection based thereon should accordingly be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the holding tube 14b disclosed by Iijima is integrated into the reflector 14 and receives the point part 18a of the aiming screw 18. *Id.* and Fig. 1.

Appln. No. 10/612,423

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1736

From this, it is submitted that Iijima fails to disclose a *channel* located within the cavity housing and connected to the reflector. Rather, the holding tube 14b is merely a pocket molded into the reflector 14 that provides clearance for the point part 18a of the aiming screw 18. The rejection based thereon should accordingly be withdrawn.

Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The arguments above regarding Iijima are equally applicable in this instance. Specifically, Iijima fails to disclose or suggest an adjustment member movable relative to the housing or a channel fixed to the reflector. In that Iijima fails to disclose or suggest the above features, it must be concluded that Iijima cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The arguments above regarding Iijima are equally applicable in this instance. Specifically, Iijima fails to disclose or suggest an adjustment member movable relative to the housing or a channel fixed to the reflector. In that Iijima fails to disclose or suggest the above features, it must be concluded that Iijima cannot

Appln. No. 10/612,423

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1736

render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn..

Respectfully submitted,

December 20, 2004
Date


Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)
Attorney for Applicant

EJS/alr